DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 302 SP 010 338

AUTHOR Shaw, Thomas L.
TITLE A Study of the Relationship between Internship Teaching Performance and Academic Grades for COP Students.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 104p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Schools; Grades (Scholastic); *Internship Programs; Literature Reviews; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Performance; Performance Factors; *Self Concept; Success Factors; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Interns; *Trainees
IDENTIFIERS *Career Opportunities Program; COP; Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; EPPS

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to determine if a functional relationship existed between internship teaching performance and academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees who interned in three local education agency schools and attended three cooperating institutions of higher education in Alabama. Another aim of the study was to determine if there were functional relationships among internship teaching performance and self-concept or academic grades and self-concept. The Pearson product-moment coefficent of correlation was used to determine relationships. The correlation coefficent between internship teaching performance and academic grades was not significant. The data for COP trainees in one school system indicating the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept (as revealed by Edward's fifteen personality variables) showed abasement to be significant. The data for trainees in the second school system indicated the relationship between internship and teaching performance and self-concept to be not significant. The data further indicated the relationship between academic grades and self-concept to be not significant. For the third group of trainees, the data showed the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept to be not significant excepting heterosexuality. The data further revealed the relationship between grade-point average and self-concept to be not significant excepting abasement and achievement. The data collected in this investigation sustained the hypothesis that there is no relationship between internship teaching performance and academic grades, and rejected the five variables of the hypothesis that there is no relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept or academic grades and self-concept. (MM)

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND ACADEMIC GRADES FOR COP STUDENTS

By

Thomas L. Shaw

B.S. Alabama State University, 1948

M.A. Atlanta University, 1955

L. W. Oliver, Ph.D., Advisor
Professor, Miles College
Birmingham, Alabama

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

June, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The most significant level for educational reform since the advent of Sputnik is a viable movement for demonstrated teaching performance. Many educators are saying the survival of our present concept of education is dependent upon how well teachers show the public that their tax dollars are being well spent.

Institutions that prepare students for teaching careers are examining performance-based and competency-based education in their quest for accountability and are beginning to question the validity of traditional methods. As stated by Gartner and Riessman:

> Frequently associated with these efforts are new measures of accountability. Some of these have to do with training (as in performance-based teacher education), or the granting of credentials (as in competency-based teacher certification), or budgeting (as in performance planning and budget system), or management (as in management by objectives). Each of these has its limits, particularly in terms of what it is that is to be measured (as well as how). Each of them can serve to demystify the work of the human service agency, force greater clarity as to purpose, give greater attention to issues of effectiveness. Each can be a substitution of process for substance, giving the facade of accountability but, in fact, serving only to replace the traditional professional managers with new technocratic managers.[1]

---

[1]Alan Gartner and Frank Riessman, "Children: Workers in Their Own Learning--A New Basis for the Organizing of Schools," COP Bulletin 3 2 (1974-1975): 14

In enigmatic reaction to pressures, some educators are losing focus on what appears to be the prime goal of the education process, that is, the learning of the child. In their assessment of teaching performance, it seems that administrators are resorting to varied and sundry tactics in order to reach certain prescribed goals. The goals sometimes reached fail to take into consideration that the philosophy of education in a democracy should be a humane involvement, designed to develop a sociable and rounded individual who may, perhaps, perpetuate some of the democratic ideals.

Obviously, there are many variables involved in human assessment which cannot be totally controlled by known means. To predict the performance of a teacher or a prospective teacher on cognitive outcomes alone would appear presumptuous. To expect every teacher to perform in an excellent manner in all categories would appear untenable. Some professors and researchers who are sophisticated in the selection of future educators believe that the teaching profession should be restricted to those who have been especially endowed.

For example, Calisch[2] observes that only brainy, top level, creative scholars should consider becoming teachers. Good teachers are good students who are intelligent, compulsive about learning and who have the ability.

---

[2]Richard W. Calisch, "So You Want to be a Real Teacher?," Today's Education 68 (November, 1969): 49-51

to read and write well. Calisch affirms that most books that he has read on teaching indicate a love of children as being a prerequisite for teaching. "Hog wash!" This has gotten a number of "softhearted" and "softheaded" people into the teaching profession.

The above notions appear to epitomize traditional educational philosophy. It would seem that teachers should have some compassion for their students; after all, children can be affected by the behavior of their teachers. Deviant adult behavior can be psychologically disastrous to many children who are in need of positive adult support, especially the deprived. The disadvantaged child needs a special kind of person--one who can meet his physical as well as his psychological needs.

Gunnar Horn[3] assumes a different point of view than that of Calisch. He suggested that knowing one's subject matter is secondary; it is how a teacher feels inside that counts. One has to love teaching as well as care for his students. He explains that the goal of teaching is to communicate with the eager, apathetic, hostile sea of faces that constitute a class.

Other educators believe that measures from intelligence scales and scholarship should be used to hypothesize how well instructors ought to perform in the classroom.

---

[3]Gunnar Horn, "Some Thoughts about Teaching and Teachers," Today's Education 59 (February, 1970): 13.

Many educators believe that good scholarship should not be used to predict the classroom performance of teachers.

Hilgard[4] noted that a good case could almost be made by proving that poor students often become our best products. A dean in one of our liberal arts colleges would surely have been rejected for graduate study if the standards for selection of his day had been those of today. Hilgard further noted that one of the first teachers of statistics at Stanford, and later at Harvard, was a poor but efficient teacher. He became one of the original authors of the Stanford Achievement Tests.

An ex-student who failed his sophomore year in college went back and eventually became the leading Ph.D. candidate at Harvard. He is now a distinguished professor at a leading university.

There is the ancient argument between hereditarians and environmentalists--the individual is endowed at birth with the necessary equipment to perform or the equipment he has is affected by his environment. There are those who take a middle of the road approach and believe that the ability to perform is a combination of both heredity and environment. If there is any validity in this belief, it would seem that a strict hereditarian approach would preclude a compensatory approach to teacher education and other attributes are not important.

---

[4]Ernest R. Hilgard, "The Human Dimension in College Teaching," NEA Journal 55 (September, 1965): 43-45.

There are educators who generalize that poor background, class or race should be equated with poor teaching performance. Nevertheless, there are screening devices obstensively designed to eliminate poor teachers as well as poor prospective teachers. These instruments have often been used to discriminate against individuals because of cultural differences.

Some educators are proponents of the open-door admissions policy which allows the individual to pursue a major in education irrespective of test scores. Continued matriculation of students at these institutions of higher education is, therefore, contingent upon their academic performance. An inordinate number of high risk students have been admitted on an "open-door" admissions basis. Some have done as well or better than the general student population. The question, it seems then, is, is there a relationship between present screening instruments, college class performance, and teaching performance? It appears that, based on a new set of criteria, the student could be instructed to the required level of competency to perform his job in a satisfactory manner. Dickson elaborates:

> This trend in American teacher education is obviously toward a stronger emphasis on performance and product. An increasing number of people in the teaching profession are becoming unwilling to accept the assumption that simply because someone "knows" something he/she can necessarily apply his knowledge. We are becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the magnitude of inference between "knowing" and "doing," and the time has come to ask prospective teachers for the evidence of what is expected of them as well as

that which is specified for them. Knowing and the ability to apply what is known are two very different matters.[5]

Obviously, some college administrators would prefer the status quo. They believe that the curricula and entry level criteria of their institutions have been time-tested. Many of these educators look with pride at the outstanding records made in technology by former students of teachers graduating from their institutions.

Gartner and Riessman[6] wrote that in a traditional sense productivity is thought of as a function of technology--the more machinery the more efficiency. This has certainly been characteristic in the manufacturing of goods. Gartner and Riessman indicated that services are labor-intensive--they use a high proportion of labor or human power in contrast to machinery or capital to produce the service product, whether it be education, health, safety, or personal services.

Most educators appear to be in agreement that academic progress cannot remain oblivious to a changing world--that old approaches do not necessarily obliterate new problems. It is also necessary to recognize that all learning does not occur in a formal classroom setting, as much of it is generated by the mass media, life experiences,

---

[5]George E. Dickson, "CBTA: Its Origins and Its State," COP Bulletin 3 2 (1974-1975): 3.

[6]Gartner and Riessman, "Children: Workers in Their Own Learning," p. 1.

and so on. Edelfelt states that:

> Education reform at this point in time should be based on the following assumptions:
>
> 1. Schools and teaching need radical reform.
> 2. All segments of the teaching profession (especially teachers) must be involved in planning, carrying out, and evaluating reform.
> 3. Public school instruction and teacher education must be closely related.
> 4. Teacher education should be a career-long enterprise.
> 5. Teaching must have a career pattern.
> 6. Parents and students must be involved in the reform of education.
>
> Pervasive reform of education and teacher education in terms of these assumptions provide a challenge unparalleled in the history of education.
>
> Not only does such reform require an examination of the purpose and content of education, it also requires reviewing what teaching is and how one learns to teach. Not only does it involve a basic reassessment of how teachers are educated, it also prompts thinking about changing the whole character of the profession. Not only does it require specifying clear and valid goals for teacher education, it also calls for laying out process and strategy for achieving reforms.[7]

Historically for some, the classroom performance of teachers has been equated with academic grades while in college. There are a number of variables such as the students' and teachers' personalities, the social background of teachers; rapport, which impinge upon teaching performance. In many instances, such matters receive little or no attention.

---

[7]Roy A. Edelfelt, "The Reform of Teacher Education," Today's Education 62 (April, 1973): 20.

Statement of the Problem

The major question raised by this investigation is: What is the relationship between grades earned by Career Opportunities Program students in three Alabama institutions of higher education and their internship teaching performance in several Alabama local education agency schools?

Specific questions include the following:

1. What is the relationship between performance in the classroom and each of the variables on the Edwards Personel Preference Schedule?

2. What is the relationship between grade-point average and each of the variables on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule?

Hypothesis

Stemming from these questions is an hypothesis which this study seeks to investigate. It is hypothesized that there would be no significant relationship between the internship teaching performance and the academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees. The sub-hypotheses for the study are:

1. There is no significant relationship between internship teaching performance and each of the variables on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

2. There is no significant relationship between grade-point average and each of the variables on the

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Definition of Terms

Career Opportunities Program--The name of the National Professions Development Act program for training paraprofessionals who could become teachers.

Internship Teaching Performance--The rating given by supervising teachers and higher education coordinators or the supervisor on a COP evaluation form developed jointly by the Jefferson County School System and the University of Alabama in Birmingham.

Personal Qualities--Measurement of sixteen variables under appearance and manner on the COP evaluation instrument.

Performance--Measurement of sixteen variables under classroom environment, pupil growth, and teaching techniques on the COP evaluation instrument.

Professional Attitude--The measurement of five variables under on-the-job and general on the COP evaluation instrument.

Dependability--The measurement of six variables under promptness and reliance on the COP evaluation instrument.

Supervising Teacher--The person who was assigned to supervise the COP paraprofessional.

Coordinator or Supervisor--The liaison person between the institutions of higher education and the local school systems.

Director of Alabama COP Consortium--The chief administrator of the Huntsville City, the Macon County, and the Wilcox County Career Opportunities Programs.

Trainee--The paraprofessional being trained by COP.

Academic Grades--Credits represented by transcripts earned or recognized by the University of Alabama in Birmingham, A&M University, and Spring Hill College.

Self-Concept--The measurement of personality variables given on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Limitations

This study was limited to black Career Opportunities Program trainees in Elementary education who interned in the Jefferson County School System, the Huntsville City School System, and the Wilcox County School System and who attended the University of Alabama in Birmingham, A&M University, and Spring Hill College. The study was further limited to those trainees who subjected themselves to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. A final limitation of the study was the number of COP trainees participating in the investigation.

There were ninety-five Career Opportunities Program elementary education trainees enrolled in the University of Alabama in Birmingham, Alabama, A&M University in Huntsville, and Spring Hill College in Mobile during the 1973-1974 academic year. The number of Career Opportunities Program trainees who were enrolled in each of the

above named institutions were 30, 40, and 25 respectively. The number of COP participants in the study were 25, 33, and 15 respectively. Of the total of seventy-three participants in the study, there were seven black males and sixty-six black females. Their ages ranged from 21 to 62.

Methodology

The students involved in the study were participants in the Career Opportunities Program. The Career Opportunities Program, or COP, is a national priority activity designed to meet the educational needs of low-income families. The program was established by the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, whose objective is to attract persons to careers in education in order to improve education and employment opportunities for the poor. Through the establishment of career lattices in school, productive careers can be followed by those recruited through this program.

The recruits may enter the college or university on an open admissions basis--many do not have high school diplomas. Their survival at the institutions of higher education is dependent upon their academic performance. COP is viewed as a partnership of schools, colleges, communities, and the State Department of Education. It is within this frame of reference that all parties are involved in all segments of the development of the program.

Essentially, COP trainees attend institutions of higher education and work in local education agency schools as paraprofessionals. Trainees may, through the career lattice, become teachers. However, the ultimate aim of the program is to enable children to learn more effectively. With the help of these paraprofessionals to relieve them of some of their routine duties, teachers will have more time to use in instructing their pupils as stated by Davies:

> Simple concepts of justice require that the middle-class value of opportunities for promotion and advancement be built into a new careers program for poor people. Dead-end jobs as teacher aides were not enough. The career ladder idea provided specific opportunities to move to more demanding and higher paying jobs and to be able to choose to pursue training required for "higher" credentials and academic degrees. The idea was not that all new careerists would want to earn bachelor's or master's degrees and qualify for advanced professional certification, only that many would be interested and have the capacity to move up the ladder and should be encouraged to do so.[8]

The Career Opportunities Program, therefore, has offered innovational alternatives in the area of education, thus serving both as a vehicle and as a catalyst for bringing about improvements in school organizations and curricula.

Collection of Data

The data for this inquiry were collected from April, 1973 to May, 1974. In August, 1973, a letter was written to the Director of the Alabama COP Consortium

---

[8]Don Davies, "EPDA: An Inside Perspective," COP Bulletin 5 2 (1974-1975): 11.

explaining the study and requesting his cooperation. A meeting was convened by him and was held at Tuskegee, Alabama in October, 1973, with local COP consortium directors and institutions of higher education coordinators to explain the proposed study. In November, 1973, letters were written to the local education agencies' superintendents requesting permission to collect data. In January and March, 1974, follow-up letters were sent to the superintendents requesting permission to collect data. Thereafter, the necessary instruments with instructions were mailed or hand delivered to the responding local education agencies. Also, visitations and telephone calls were made to the data collecting sites.

The returned copies of the internship teaching performance evaluating instruments and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule answer sheets were hand scored. Tabulations were then placed on specially prepared forms.

Internship Teaching Performance

The institution of higher education supervisor and the COP director collected the data for the Jefferson County Career Opportunities Program. These data were collected from the supervising teachers in three cooperating COP elementary schools.

The local Career Opportunities Program Director in the Huntsville City School System and the Director of the Alabama Career Opportunities Program Consortium, along with

others, collected the internship teaching performance scales from the supervising teachers in several elementary schools. The Career Opportunities Program Director for the Wilcox County School System and the institution of higher education coordinator, Spring Hill College, collected the internship teaching performance scales for the trainees who interned in schools with elementary grades.

Academic Grades

The Career Opportunities Program coordinators and the supervisor employed by the three involved institutions of higher education ascertained grades from the registrars' offices in their respective institutions. The grade-point averages were computed from previously transferred credits and/or credits earned at their respective institutions. Grade-point averages were forwarded to the writer by the Career Opportunities Program directors, coordinators, and the supervisor of the three cooperating institutions.

Self-Concept

The Edwards Personal Preferende Schedule was administered in mass to the Career Opportunities Program trainees in the Jefferson County School System by the Institution of Higher Education's supervisor. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was administered to the Huntsville City School System COP trainees under the direction of the local COP director, and to the Wilcox County COP trainees under the direction of the COP director.

Analysis of Data

The necessary data were compiled on prepared data forms (see Appendix D) for COP trainees attending the University of Alabama in Birmingham, A&M University in Huntsville, and Spring Hill College in Mobile, and those who interned in several local education agency schools.

The Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were computed on the basis of internship teaching performance and the following variables:

1. academic grades
2. achievement
3. deference
4. order
5. exhibition
6. autonomy
7. affiliation
8. intraception
9. succorance
10. dominance
11. abasement
12. nurturance
13. change
14. endurance
15. heterosexuality
16. aggression.

The Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were computed on the basis of academic grades and

the following variables:

1. internship teaching performance
2. achievement
3. deference
4. order
5. exhibition
6. autonomy
7. affiliation
8. intraception
9. succorance
10. dominance
11. abasement
12. nurturance
13. change
14. aggression
15. heterosexuality
16. endurance

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

Internship teaching performance and academic grades were the two main variables involved in the study. However, there were fifteen variables involved in self-concept as measured by Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. An examination of the relations between all of the variables showed a linear correlation.

The formula for the Pearson product-moment correlation is:[9]

$$r = \frac{\Sigma(X - \bar{X})(Y - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\Sigma(X - \bar{X})^2 \Sigma(Y - \bar{Y})^2}}$$

The central theme of the study was internship teaching performance ratings for COP trainees by supervising teachers and the institution of higher education supervisor or coordinators and academic grades as represented by grade-point averages from two universities and one college. The main purpose was, through statistical means, to confirm or refute the relationships between the variables above.

The second concern was to determine if significant relations existed among performance ratings, academic grades, and self-concept as represented by Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The hypothesis tested was the null hypothesis. Fisher indicates:

> In relation to any experiment we may speak of this hypothesis as the "null hypothesis," and it should be noted that the null hypothesis is never proved or established, but is possibly disproved, in the course of experimentation. Every experiment may be said to exist only in order to give the facts a chance of disproving the null hypothesis.[10]

---

[9]Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958), p. 143.

[10]Richard P. Runyon and Audrey Haber, Fundamental Behavioral Statistics (Reading: Wesley Publishing Company, 1971), p. 167.

A significant difference is explained by Garrett:

> A difference is called significant when the probability is so high that it cannot be attributed to chance (i.e., temporary and accidental factors) and hence represents a true difference between population means.[11]

This study, unlike many others, was concerned only with general grade-point averages of the Career Opportunities Program trainees enrolled in the three institutions of higher education.

The hypotheses to be tested were: there is no relationship between internship teaching performance and academic grades and there is no relationship among internship teaching performance, academic grades, and self-concept. A table by Richmond[12] entitled "The Value of the Correlation Coefficients for Different Levels of Significance" with the value of r at the 5 per cent and the 1 per cent levels was used.

Significance of the Study

For too long, fiducial limits have been set for those educationists whose innovative imaginations have gone beyond the professor's classroom. An immoderate number of those who are responsible for education are not

---

[11]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1958), p. 213.

[12]Samuel B. Richmond, Statistical Analysis (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1964), p. 582.

amenable to change--they are simply out of touch with reality. There are those who believe that a restructuring of education is needed, but they lack guidance or direction. From this study, pertinent information may be received which can serve as a stimulus. The writer is cognizant of the fact that this investigation will not revolutionize present educational thought, but may point up areas for further investigation. Finally, the study can give some insight relative to restrictions or use of prospective teachers on the basis of a single criterion, perhaps, aiding and abetting an alteration in such procedures.

Summary

Many educators are cognizant of the fact that there needs to be a change in teacher education and are examining performance-based and competency-based teacher education concepts in their quest for accountability. A number of educators believe that prospective teachers ought to be excellent students who are compulsive about learning. They further believe that teacher trainees should be experts, specialists, scholars who do not necessarily have a love for children. Their main objective should be to help students acquire knowledge.

Others take the opposite point of view, that knowing is not enough--that it is difficult to predict the performance of teachers on the basis of scholarship because

of the number of variables involved. These educators conclude that prospective teachers should be selected on the basis of job performance as well as scholarship.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The related studies selected for this investigation were studies not only involving teaching performance ratings and academic grades, but also studies involving the National Teacher Examinations. The sources of the information utilized were the Education Index, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and other applicable sources. Although unlimited attempts have been made to evaluate teaching performance, many of the developed tests and measures were unavailable.

As some past research by Mitzel[1] indicated, there is hope for educational reforms. He suggested that teaching has been studied by investigators as it occurs in the real life classroom. The efforts of these investigators have not been based on what they have heard in educational methods classes or the findings from the laboratory work on animals. Their research is based on the assumption that the way the teacher behaves in the classroom is what affects his students--pupil performance should determine the value of measured teaching behavior.

---

[1] Harold E. Mitzel, "Can We Measure Teaching Objectives?," Journal of National Education Association 53 (January, 1964): 35.

Review of Related Literature

The review of the related literature concerning this study involves the following:

1. studies that show a direct relationship to the present study;

2. studies which implicate professional preparation and teacher effectiveness;

3. studies involving teacher placement, academic success, and self-concept; and

4. research which was related to the Career Opportunities Program.

A study by William F. Greaves[2] investigated the relationship between teaching performance and academic achievement. He was especially interested in determining the relationship between student-teacher evaluation performance ratings and undergraduate cumulative grade-point averages which may, to some extent, predict teaching success. The study involved 222 first-year teachers who taught in grades 1 to 12.

The results indicated that there was no significant correlation between first-year teaching performance in their major teaching field, overall academic record, or teaching preparation courses. He found that after

---

[2] William Frank Greaves, "Criteria for Teacher Selection Based upon a Comparison of Pregraduation Performance and Teaching Success" (Ed.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972).

computing a significant step-wise multiple regression, the most important predictions of first-year teaching preparation were: understands pupils, grade-point average in teaching preparation courses, potential as a teacher, desire to improve, and a knowledge of subjects which are observed in student teaching. In addition, the above variables when combined with grade-point average in teacher preparation courses tend to be the best predictors of first-year teaching performance.

A study which involved the National Teacher Examinations, academic averages, and teachers in the field was conducted by James Thacker.[3] In an attempt to evaluate the preparation of teachers, Thacker studied the relationship between scores on the National Teacher Examinations, academic averages, estimates of potential as a teacher, and principals' ratings of teaching performances. The sample was obtained from the first group of teachers in North Carolina to take the National Teacher Examinations under the direction of the North Carolina General Assembly. The examination scores, academic averages, and potential estimates were designated independent variables, while the performance ratings by principals were designated the dependent variables. Correlation coefficients were computed between each independent variable and the

[3]James Allen Thacker, "A Study of the Relationship between Principals' Estimates of Teaching Efficiency and Scores on the National Teacher Examinations, Academic Averages, and Supervisors' Estimates of Potential for Selected Teachers in North Carolina" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1964).

dependent variable; intercorrelations were computed among the independent variables. The major conclusion reflected that neither scores on the National Teacher Examinations, academic averages; nor estimate of potential taken individually or in combination, were efficient predictors of teaching performance. The results further revealed that little weight should be placed in scores on the National Teacher Examinations in assessing academic averages or performance in the teaching or practicum phase of professional education.

A similar study was conducted by William Carr Leavitt[4] which utilized the National Teacher Examinations. This study focused on the relationship among scores on the National Teacher Examinations, grade-point averages in professional courses, and grade-point averages in the first teaching field. The population consisted of eighty elementary student teachers and seventy-seven secondary student teachers enrolled in North Texas University.

The major findings indicated that the National Teacher Examinations had little value in predicting the success of students who were preparing for student teaching. The grade-point averages in professional courses

[4]William Carr Leavitt, "The Relationship among Performance in Student Teaching Scores on the National Teacher Examinations and Grade-point Averages in Professional Courses and in the First Teaching Field" (Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1969).

and the first teaching field had little value in predicting the success of those students who were preparing to become teachers. The researcher concluded that teaching is a very complex behavioral act and a very personal thing with many uncontrollable and indefinable variables existing between the teacher and the student. He affirmed that it is highly improbable that any test will measure teaching effectiveness.

A research effort was made by A. Wilbur Brewer[5] to investigate the relationship between principal-rated beginning teacher success and academic achievement. The study involved 340 first-year secondary teachers who were graduates of Washington State University.

The major findings revealed a low correlation between principal-rated beginning teacher success and academic achievement. In secondary cases, the relationship between principal-rated beginning teacher success and academic achievement was significant; however, in elementary cases, the relationship between principal-rated beginning teacher success was found to be not significant. When elementary and secondary cases were combined, the relationship between principal-related beginning teacher success in all pre-certification course work, professional course work, and non-education course work was significant.

---

[5]A. Wilbur Brewer, "A Study of the Relationship between Principal-Rated Beginning Teacher Success and Certain Selected Aspects of Academic Achievement" (Ed.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1966).

A notable study involving the National Teacher Examinations and four variables was conducted by Phyllis B. Mercer.[6] The purpose of the investigation was to determine if relationships existed between scores on the National Teacher Examinations, professional education, grade-point average, overall grade-point average, and the evaluation of student teaching performance by supervising teachers and university supervisors. The sample included seventy-five students enrolled in East Texas State University.

The major findings revealed that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients indicated significant relationships between scores on the National Teacher Examinations, professional education, and overall grade-point averages. The results indicated that significant differences were found between evaluation of student teaching performance by supervising teachers and university supervisors. Significant relationships between professional education and overall grade-point averages and student teaching performance were also revealed.

A study by Curry[7] analyzed the relationship of academic success to teacher placement and success in

---

[6]Phyllis Beth Mercer, "A Study of the Relationship between Scores on the National Teacher Examinations, Teaching Performance, and other Variables in Selected Groups of Secondary Student Teachers" (Ed.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1972).

[7]George Wendell Curry, "An Analysis of the Relationship of Academic Success to Teacher Placement and

teaching of student teachers at Ball State University. The sample included 141 prospective teachers who graduated in 1962 and 1963 and sought employment after graduation.

The 141 graduates were divided into groups according to grade-point averages and were selected by the Fisher Yates Random Sampling Method. The investigation indicated a relationship between academic success and teacher placement; also, between academic success and success in teaching. The significant differences were in the relationship of grade-point averages to the following variables: obtaining a position of preference, teaching assignment received in the major area of study by graduates in secondary education, teaching in a desired area of choice, success in maintaining the type of preferred classroom climate, being rated as successful teachers by principals, and success in teaching as rated by superintendents.

An investigation by Gerfen[8] involved the following variables: administrative evaluation, grade-point averages, test scores for admission to teacher education, letter grades in education courses, evaluation by supervising teachers, evaluation by college supervisors, and

---

Success in Teaching of 141 Student Teachers at Ball State University, 1961-62 and 1962-63" (Ed.D. dissertation, Ball State University, 1967).

[8] Richard Lewis Gerfen, "Analysis of Selected Variables in the Preparation and Performance of Teachers" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970).

self-concept.

The findings indicated no significant relationships existed between administrative evaluations of the subject teachers and the pre-service variables. A significant relationship existed between the subject teachers' self-concepts and graduate record examination scores in social science. However, no significant difference existed in the obtained R as a predictive measure for teacher effectiveness when self-concepts were included with grade-point averages in major fields and education.

Fred L. Pigge concerned himself with the rating of teachers by elementary principals. He indicated:

> The problem of this study was to ascertain whether elementary principals rated teachers who had been "A" students in college significantly higher than they rated teachers who had "C" grade-point averages. The analyses were based on the returns of a teaching effectiveness checklist from 83 principals of "A" and 71 principals of "C" teachers. The teachers were chosen at random from pools of eligible candidates. Significant findings were computed from 2 X K contingency tables. . . .
>
> For fifteen of the 32 trait descriptions on the checklist, the principals rated the "A" teachers significantly higher than the "C" teachers. The principals did not rate the "C's" higher than the "A's" for any trait. Treating checked numerals as score points, the calculated t-ratio between the means showed that the "A" teachers scored significantly higher than the "C" teachers. The general conclusion of this study is that the elementary principals did rate former college students who had an accumulative "A" GPA significantly . . . higher than they did the teachers who made "C" records during their college years.[9]

---

[9] Fred L. Pigge, "Teaching Effectiveness of "A" and "C" Elementary Teachers," Journal of Educational Research 62 (November, 1968): 99-102.

As one can see from the selected studies, the problem of evaluation or performance and academic grades has not been settled. However, Davies states very succintly that there is probably cause for promise, and a need for redirection. Don Davies points out:

> Fewer professions have developed so acute a sense of outrage at their own shortcomings as the education profession. While this outrage has some useful motivating characteristics, it clearly isn't enough to reform American education. Most efforts directed toward such a reformation fail because they focus on input rather than output, on process instead of performance. . . . Programs to bring new kinds of people into the schools and to demonstrate, through training, a new and more effective means of utilizing educational personnel and delivering educational services. These include the Career Opportunities Program, the Teacher Corps, programs for trainers of teacher trainers; programs on school personnel utilization to explore a variety of differentiated staffing patterns, and the state grants program for meeting immediate critical shortages of teachers and aides. . . .[10]

This study showed a similarity to the studies cited because it tended to determine the relationship between teacher evaluation performance and academic grades. However, the study differed from the cited studies in many respects: (a) it concerned itself with older Alabama black Career Opportunities Program trainees who served as paraprofessionals in three different school systems and who attended three different kinds of institutions of higher education; (b) it was concerned with an overall grade-point average instead of grade-point averages in

---

[10]Don Davies, "Come Out from Under the Ivy," American Education 6 (March, 1970): 28-30.

certain professional courses; and (c) the involved studies, save one study, did not use personality instruments to assess self-concept.

Most colleges have belabored the rationale of admitting "academically questionable" students to their teacher education programs. Hence, a number of barriers have been imposed by these colleges which would eliminate cultural and racial minorities who could not meet certain prescribed criteria. However, many of these colleges have joined the COP team which has enabled them to "dismount their high opinions" and get into the mainstream of activity.

Summary

The related literature revealed that some researchers found that there was a relationship between performance-evaluation ratings and academic grades, while other researchers found no relationship to exist. On the question of the National Teacher Examinations, as used in three cited studies, it was indicated that there was no relationship between teaching performance and the National Teacher Examinations.

CHAPTER III

INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE CORRELATED WITH ACADEMIC GRADES

Internship Teaching Performance

Many teacher education researchers and educators are cognizant that performance evaluation is a complex process. McKenna explains: "Evaluation is a complicated activity, difficult to conceptualize fully in all its ramifications and even more difficult to implement with sound substance and fair play."[1]

Researchers continue in their efforts to appraise and improve education through the development of measures to identify those characteristics which are termed imperative to successful teaching. The literature seems to reveal that, frequently, these sought after measures have not been approached scientifically. The search goes on to gain more information to build many instruments dealing with the observation of teacher behavior.

There is concern for fair play in an effort to reshape education through performance evaluation. Gartman and Riessman discuss:

---

[1]Bernard H. McKenna, "Teacher Evaluation--Some Implications," Today's Education 62 (February, 1973): 56.

> The problem of evaluation of human services is enormous, perhaps even more complex than it is in the social sciences in general. Let us look at a few examples. If we use achievement or reading test scores to assess the effectiveness of teachers, we are faced with the problem that the teachers may then "teach to the test." And in extreme cases, such as in the performance contracting examples in Texarkana, they may actually provide the tests in advance. If we utilize a measure of the students' self-concept, as a way of evaluating some educational intervention, the question arises, has his or her self-concept improved while cognitive performance remained the same? If we use the teacher's judgment as to what has been happening to the work of the pupils, it obviously has potential bias as the teacher may want to indicate that he or she is doing a good job, while an outside independent judge may be less capable of assessing what is going on every day and/or may obtain a restricted performance on the day of evaluation. On and on go limitations, whether it be of teacher performance, psycho-therapy (e.g., the patient's subjective report of being better may illustrate only brainwashing by the psychiatrist), or other services.[2]

Many school systems have begun to evaluate teaching performance by the product--the achievement of the child. A number of administrators have begun to develop fears that holding teachers accountable for the achievement of their students may generate undue pressures on pupils and teachers, perhaps, causing immeasurable psychological problems--mainly anxiety.

There has been a perennial problem of how to evaluate COP. Merrow elaborates:

> From the first, how to evaluate COP was something of a problem. Measuring teacher effectiveness has proved to be a terribly tough nut to crack. How then to quantify the impact of COP-trained aides on kids? The COP hypothesis was that indigenous, "street

---

[2]Gartner and Riessman, "Children in Their Own Learning," p. 15.

> smart," elementary school teachers would lead to improvements in the children's learning. But learning gains, as measured by standardized tests, are fickle; they must persist over several years before statisticians will dispel the cloud of qualifying statements that fill the footnotes of their studies. And years of further study introduce new complications--the kids move out of the school district, have new teachers and are absent on the days the tests are given, and so forth.[3]

There are a number of variables involved in performance evaluation which may impinge upon quality performance. Bolton states:

> It is sometimes difficult to determine whether poor results are due to poor performance on the part of the teacher or to situational constraints that prevent better teacher performance. When there is any doubt on the question, it is essential that the teacher's working conditions receive direct attention during the evaluation. Sometimes the environment (including supplies and materials) as well as the psychological factors that might influence the effectiveness of the teacher will help to prevent poor judgments about the teacher.[4]

Many school people believe that present evaluation instruments lack validity. They point to the fact that two or more persons observing the same teacher simultaneously may not agree in the quality of the teaching observed. Mitzel discusses encouraging past research regarding the performance evaluation of the teacher:

> The contribution of their inquiry to an emerging science of teaching has been more classificatory and methodological than definitive and substantive. The researchers have wrestled with the historic problems of scientific study. They have tried out a variety

---

[3]John Merrow, "Rutgers Graduate COP Program," COP Bulletin 4 2 (1974-1975): 2.

[4]Dale L. Bolton, Selection and Evaluation of Teachers (Berkeley: McCritchen, 1973), p. 30.

> of techniques for recording the teaching phenomena: audio-tapes, kinescope film from closed circuit television, direct observation by trained observers and time lapse photography. They have developed numerous trial variables retaining those that assessed stable aspects of teacher and pupil behavior. All of these steps are preliminary aspects of an emerging science.[5]

There are several instruments which may be utilized by experts, peers, and trainees in recording observations. Such instruments as the Flanders and Amidon Schedules for the analysis of interaction may be used in recording data. The Teaching Evaluation Record developed by Dwight E. Beecher which provides a total score as an index of teaching success has had wide acclaim.

In relation to measures of assessment which should merit serious consideration, Poppendieck writes:

> The principle of judgment is essential to performance. Too long we've sought for easy objective criteria that don't rest on individual insight and judgment. It has been a false trail. While criteria, and checklists with annotations, and case analyses can be used as aides to judgments--means of making more objectives--there is finally no substitute for human judgment. Dialogue, group appraisal, client interrogation--these are supporting techniques that focus professional competence on decision-making but it stands that assessing performance involves human judgment.[6]

Obviously, there is a lack of a pure assessment measure which, of course, many believe should not preclude the use of several measures of assessing performance or

---

[5]Mitzel, "Can We Measure Teaching Objectives?," p. 35.

[6]Robert Poppendieck, "The Outlook for the Performance Impact on Teacher Certification," Paper Prepared for BEPD, U. S. Office of Education (n.d.), pp. 6-7.

product. The subjectivity of judgment then may be compromised by the use of multiple indicators of assessment. The use of multiple indicators is an attempt to compensate for the possibility of error on a single measurement instrument and/or the subjectivity of judgment. Other educators conclude that the use of a single assessment measure would be an inadequate indicator of good assessment.

The evaluation instrument for the performance of COP trainees, as revealed by the sample instrument in Appendix C, involved four major categories: personal qualities, performance, dependability, and professional attitude. The first part, personal qualities, referred to appropriateness of dress, personal neatness, hygiene, and to the individual's ability to maintain a standard of personal appearance in keeping with the demands of his/her position.

The second section, performance, included the extent to which the individual showed initiative, assisted in maintaining an attractive meaningful, conducive-to-learning atmosphere, helped students develop good study and work habits, led pupils into democratic participation, shared responsibility and decision making, planned and organized work in an effective manner, possessed an adequate subject matter background, used a variety of teaching aides, tutored pupils in weak subject areas, assisted the teacher in developing a resource unit, planned and

taught a lesson, and assisted the teacher in maintaining reports.

The third category, dependability, included the extent to which the trainee arrived on time and went directly to the classroom, adhered to the schedule set by the teacher or principal, completed assignment tasks in a reasonable time, placed materials in proper place after use, independent self-direction, and making necessary decisions regarding work.

The fourth section, professional attitude, involved a pleasant cooperative attitude toward supervising teachers, a respect for faculty and school personnel, pride in the profession, an attempt to promote respect for the profession, improving self by studying, experimenting and participating, and adhering to any reasonable pattern of behavior imposed by the community for professional people.

The variable ratings ranged on a continuum of 1-5 (unsatisfactory to excellent). Other categories could be added by the evaluator to the instrument; however, other categories would preclude a uniform score yield.

The supervising teacher in the classroom worked with each trainee on a one-to-one basis, in most instances for the school year. In many cases, the supervising teacher had worked with the same student previously. Trainees were, for example, rotated among the local education agency schools; that is, COP trainees did not often

work two consecutive years in the same school.

An inordinate amount of discussion has been generated with regard to teachers as evaluators. Sweet elaborates:

> The role of an evaluator is sometimes difficult for a teacher. Giving positive feedback or complimenting a paraprofessional for a job well done is not difficult, but dealing with unsatisfactory performance requires the courage to face a problem and deal with it objectively. The teacher should meet privately with the paraprofessional, discuss problems openly and objectively and suggest ways for improvement. She/he should listen carefully to anything the paraprofessional has to say about the problem and make sure that he/she understands exactly what is expected. Although the emphasis should be on the positive evaluation, both positive and negative feedback are necessary if a paraprofessional is to develop as an effective team member. When a teacher fails to deal with a problem, the team relationship deteriorates to the point where the teacher and paraprofessional can no longer work together . . . the paraprofessional may be more successful with another teacher, in some cases must be discharged.[7]

The institutions of higher education coordinators and supervisor employed by two universities and one college functioned in assisting in improving the affairs of the trainees in the local education agency schools and institutions of higher education. They had tremendous impact upon the evaluation ratings or performance ratings of the COP trainees.

Many of the COP trainees who had been evaluated were experienced paraprofessionals who had children of their own and had previously held jobs. Of the seventy-three

---

[7]Alan Sweet, "A Decade of Paraprofessional Programs in Minneapolis Public Schools," COP Bulletin 6 2 (1974-1975): 11-12.

trainees rated on the instrument, approximately 90 per cent were female and approximately 10 per cent were male.

Academic Grades

The schools in which grades were obtained involved three different types of institutions of higher education--a predominantly white state university with a 3.0 grade scale, a predominantly black state institution with a predominantly white graduate program using a 4.0 grade scale, and a small Catholic college with a 4.0 grade scale. The community schools in which the trainees worked ranged from a highly technological-oriented north Alabama city to a small poor rural south Alabama town.

Much has been written; many studies have been made with regard to academic grades while in college. Kalish discusses:

> For many students, the most difficult task in college is adjusting to the academic demands. . . . Because of the grading system, particularly in large classes, some students will inevitably receive low grades. Poor grades, particularly for those accustomed to being among the better students, can lead to irrational, self-defeating behavior.
>
> The student blames everyone but himself, and becomes bitter, or, he may feel inadequate and decide to give up. On the other hand, low grades affect some students like a cold shower on a sleepy person--the shock jolts them back to reality.
>
> Although academic aptitude accounts for a substantial proportion of one's level of achievement, many good students never finish college, and some poor students with low aptitude scores do receive degrees. Students who achieve at a higher level than their test scores predict are characterized by having high self-esteem, realistic goals, academic (rather than social) interests and activities, good

relationships with peers and authority figures, and anxiety that--although not absent, is under control. . . .[8]

Some students who have the propensity for college work often do not have the opportunity to attend such institutions because of financial and other problems. A number of students who are admitted to college are involved with a social class variable which may or may not impinge upon academic achievement. According to Brookover and Gottlieb:

> Variation in reference group, motivation, self-perception, school "social climates," teachers and other adult expectations of the school, and other factors may account for some differences in educational achievement and other school behavior which have attributed to social class. Much more examination of such intervening variables is needed.
>
> The large number of lower class youth who enter and complete extended programs of higher education demonstrates that education provides a relatively clear opportunity for social mobility in American society, although class differences exist, increasingly large proportions of undergraduate and graduate student bodies are drawn from lower strata of the society.
>
> The commonly held assumption that social classes differ in the value they attach to education is questioned. In contrast, the demand for equal educational opportunities indicates that lower socio-economic groups place a high premium on education. Differences in consumption of higher education may be due to the fact that lower strata persons are less sophisticated in knowing how to operate in the educational bureaucracy and in relating specific educational programs to their aspirations.[9]

---

[8] Richard A. Kalish, The Psychology of Human Behavior (Belmont: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1970), p. 406.

[9] W. W. Charters and N. L. Gage, Reading in the Social Psychology of Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962), p. 11.

An awareness exists that academic achievement is associated with academic grades--often the judgment made by teachers who give grades is based on irrevelant criteria. Usually such instructors will base their conclusions on one aspect of the student's behavior at a given time. In order to nullify certain effects, many instructors and professors have resorted to a variety of evaluation criteria to off-set "so-called" objective type examinations. Some students who are quite capable of performing under certain conditions frequently fail on tests because of anxiety and other factors.

It is to be noted again that academic achievement is often equated with academic grades earned in school. That is, on occasions students take easy courses to receive good grades while expending little energy; on the other hand, some students take more difficult and time-consuming courses to receive poor grades.

Many professors expouse different philosophies regarding academic grades. An immoderate number of the educators believe that students must earn what they receive through examinations and analyses; moreover, others believe that assigning grades is merely a waste of time. Ladas explains:

> One concern is over the inflation of the number of A's given. A more serious concern is that grades be firmly based on achievement. One way to emphasize achievement is to incorporate it into the definition:
> A grade is a measure of academic achievement using an explicit standard.

> It follows that grades shall not be awarded merely for classroom attendance, effort, or professed need, and that higher grades shall not be awarded to bolster students' (or instructors') self-image or placate students. It also follows that grades shall be based on the degree of success shown by each student in fulfilling the goals of the course, that students be admitted only to those courses for which they have prerequisites and that remediation and other assistance continue to be made available where necessary. Possibilities of self-paced learning and other flexible uses of time should be encouraged. An effort should be made beginning with multi-sectioned courses to reach agreement on course goals, the basis for evaluation of student performance (papers, classroom performance, examinations) and the grades appropriate for each level of achievement.[10]

It is difficult to access competences by the grading system because the criteria which constitute competence are yet unclear. Then, who is to say what students are better than other students? Holt writes;

> In all my previous teaching, I have had to give regular grades. That is, I have had to say that some students were better than others. At first, I thought this a good thing, believing, as many teachers do, that grades, particularly low ones, spurred students on to work harder. Later, I came to feel that grading was bad. But it was a matter of give grades or don't teach, and, for many reasons that seemed good at the time, I wanted to teach. In time, I arrived at a rule that seemed to work: if you must grade, grade as seldom, as privately and as easily as possible.[11]

Individuals who have been involved in education for any length of time are aware of some of the devious ways in which grades are received by students and assigned by professors. However, it must be concluded that grades

---

[10]Harold Ladas, "Grades: Standardizing the Unstandardized Standard," Phi Delta Kappan 51 (October, 1974): 29.

[11]John Holt, "I Oppose Testing, Marking, and Grading," Today's Education 60 (March, 1971): 29.

received and given by such means are negligible in comparison with students and professors who make honest efforts to be fair.

The human element often supercedes "so-called" objectivity in the assignment of grades to various students; for example, some students are given preferential treatment by professors. Others adhere strictly in the Gaussain curve concept--those tested must fall in certain percentage categories. They do not question the validity of the mathematical theory involved. These professors believe inevitably that a prescribed quota of students evaluated must receive failing grades.

The ultimate aim of most American college students is to be successful in college; that is, to earn good grades. However, many European institutions do not give grades--they give lengthy oral and written tests to assess achievement. These tests cover the entire course of study--if the student is successful, he/she is awarded his/her diploma. If the student fails the tests, he/she is given another chance, six months to a year later. Kalish examines the Japanese system of education with regard to grades:

> In Japan, high school students are under tremendous pressure to get into good universities--much greater pressure than students in the United States. However, once they have been accepted, they worry less about grades, since almost no one leaves college because of low grades. College graduation occurs when the student has passed all his required courses and the necessary number of electives. If he fails a few courses along the way, no one cares much.

> One Japanese student commented, "I think the American university system is cruel. It forces so much competition that students come to dislike each other. Our Japanese system is much better--students do not need to be afraid they will have to leave the university. When they have learned enough, they receive their degree. In America, if I take a very difficult course and get a D, the grade hurts my record, and no one cares if I learned anything from the course--it would have been better if I had not taken it. But in Japan, no one cares if I get a D, and I may learn a great deal."[12]

Many American institutions, in an attempt to relieve tension, have begun assigning pass and fail grades to their students. This approach has enabled many of the students to get on with the problem at hand--learning. Instructors in a number of institutions have shown a reluctance in failing students. Postman indicates:

> Most of the high school and college teachers I know are reluctant to fail students or to give sharply differentiated grades not because they are afraid of students or want to avoid being known as tough graders. They simply cannot (cannot, not will not) formulate the sort of precise goals that would be necessary for a no-nonsense grading policy.
>
> In fact, where it is possible to do so, most teachers I know give quite explicitly defined grades. For example, math teachers seem to have a pretty firm notion of exactly what problems their students ought to be able to solve. As a result, they give tests on which students get grades like 83, 64, and 73 1/2. But when it comes to English, history, philosophy, psychology, art, music, we have entirely different sort of problems.[13]

A few college students hardly attend some classes because instructors grade solely on the basis of test

---

[12]Kalish, The Psychology of Human Behavior; p. 397.

[13]Neil Postman, "A D+ for Mr. Ladas," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (November, 1974): 187.

results. These students have often become sophisticated in test taking and are able to pass the course with a good grade. However, their knowledge and feel of all aspects of the course are sometimes questioned.

Then there are students who earn good grades by auditing certain courses. These students will audit a course as many times as they believe necessary to take it and earn a good grade.

There are many variables involved in grading which cannot easily be sorted out and categorized. It appears that proponents of strict grading believe that grading can be an objective matter while others believe that grading is too subjective and has too many intrusive variables to be objective.

Correlation Data

The correlation data for internship teaching performance and overall grade-point averages were collected by supervising teachers and institutions of higher education coordinators and a supervisor. These data were collected from the Jefferson County School System and the University of Alabama in Birmingham, the Huntsville City School System and A&M University in Huntsville, and the Wilcox County School System and Spring Hill College in Mobile.

The seventy-three participants who provided the internship performance and overall grade-point average

data were selected because of their availability and a shown willingness to be subjected to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Some few of the prospective participants believed the Edwards Schedule to be an invasion of privacy, hence precluding their inclusion in the study.

The highest score attainable on the Career Opportunities Program evaluation instrument was 175.

As shown in Table 1, the mean score on the performance rating scale for Jefferson County was 112.9 with a standard deviation of 35.7. The mean grade-point average for trainees attending the University of Alabama in Birmingham was 1.4 with a standard deviation of .34.

TABLE 1

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND ACADEMIC GRADES FOR JEFFERSON COUNTY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN BIRMINGHAM

	Means	Standard Deviations	r
ITP	112.9	35.7	+ .14
GPA	1.4	.34	

Table 2 shows the mean internship teaching performance for the Huntsville City School System as 155.4 with a standard deviation of 15.3. The mean grade-point average for those trainees attending Alabama A&M University

was 2.8 with a standard deviation of .65.

TABLE 2

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND ACADEMIC GRADES FOR HUNTSVILLE CITY AND A&M UNIVERSITY

	Means	Standard Deviations	r
ITP	155.4	15.3	+ .05
GPA	2.8	.65	

According to Table 3, the mean internship teaching performance rating for the Wilcox County School System was 156.6 with a standard deviation of 12.6. The mean grade-point average for those attending the Spring Hill College was 1.6 with a standard deviation of .12.

TABLE 3

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND ACADEMIC GRADES FOR WILCOX COUNTY AND SPRING HILL COLLEGE

	Means	Standard Deviations	r
ITP	156.5	12.6	- .22
GPA	1.6	.12	

The variables between internship teaching performance and academic grades showed a linear relationship. The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation then was employed to affirm or refute the hypothesis that there was no relationship between internship teaching performance and academic grades. A table of r using degrees of freedom to ascertain the 1 per cent and 5 per cent levels of significance was applied.

The coefficients of correlation were +.14 for Jefferson County School System and the University of Alabama in Birmingham; +.05 for Huntsville City School System and A&M University; and -.22 for Wilcox County School System and Spring Hill College. (See coefficients of correlation in Tables 1, 2, and 3.)

Summary

Teacher performance evaluation is an extremely complex activity--difficult to conceptualize. More than one person evaluating the same individual will often reach different conclusions with respect to performance.

Those educators who have the responsibility of evaluating their students by assigning them grades are often at odds. Many of these instructors question the validity of the elusive criteria which have been used by teachers or educational systems to evaluate students. Frequently, lower grade assignments without adequate criteria have resulted in the student being stigmatized.

CHAPTER IV

SELF-CONCEPT

Much has been written about self-concept as it relates to group membership--especially social class identification and particularly ethnic-group identification. The above is most pronounced in the pursuit of educational goals. Kalish notes:

> Nowhere is the importance of social class values better exemplified than in the pursuit of educational and vocational goals. Even the use of education as a means of achieving goals is value acceptable primarily to the working-class, middle-class, and upper-class. Lower-social class people seldom consider education as proper for themselves.[1]

Many lower-class individuals tend to break the social class structure. Kalish explains:

> Yet, in spite of the picture, some lower-social class children break the pattern, get a good education or training, and obtain a job which is generally regarded as a working-class or middle-class position. These people have received help and encouragement from a teacher, a minister, a parent, or a family friend.[2]

Obviously, based on the above observations, a number of educationists conclude that performance and grades are somewhat related to self-concept in lower-class students.

---

[1]Kalish, The Psychology of Human Behavior, p. 335.

[2]Ibid., p. 336.

Pishel discusses performance and grades as related to self-concept:

> It is assumed that one must perform well to get required grades for successful course completion. Many students perform poorly and do not make satisfactory grades. Poor performance may become self-perpetuating, since attitudes and behavioral routine are relatively enduring. A poor performer would be less likely to contribute to society as satisfactorily as one whose performance was judged to be good. Discovery of what factors consistently relate to high and low grade achievement is therefore a useful educational research objective.
>
> A literature search revealed how little success there has been relating personality and attitudinal factors to achieved grades. (1) Albott and Haney studied self-concepts focusing on interpersonal behavior as relating to scholastic performance; (2) they found only a marginal relationship to exist. Personality adaptiveness was suggested as an area for further attention which might be associated with scholastic performance. A study by Jones and Grieneeks (3) found that the most powerful predictor of scholarship was the student's self-concept of ability. Thus, self-evaluation measures can be predictive of scholarship.[3]

A number of researchers are of the opinion that self-concept is one of the most influential factors affecting the behavior of the individual student teacher. Garvey discusses the relationship between self-reported measures of self-concept and success in student teaching:

> Those seniors rated high in student teaching do, as one might anticipate, report higher self-concepts, especially in relation to identity (what I am); evidence less confusion, uncertainty and conflict in self-perception, particularly in scores on net conflict and total variability scales; and demonstrate less similarity to patient or disturbed groups (GM, NDS) and more to the well-integrated group (PI).

---

[3]Robert G. Pishel, Jr., "Achieved Grades as a Function of Self-Perceived Adaptability," Journal of Educational Research 67 (December, 1973): 166.

> The converse appears to be true, at least for Row 1 and GM, and the absence of a linear relationship seems evident for PI.
>
> These findings may merely confirm what teacher educators and supervisors have long suspected--that success in student teaching is affected, but not necessarily determined, by a positive view of one's self, lack of confusion in self-perception, and good adjustment. But supplementing intuition with quantitative information prior to the student-teaching experience may assist those responsible for the preparation of teachers in helping their students learn effectively to "use themselves" as professional workers. . . .
>
> The results of this modest exploratory effort suggest the desirability of investigating also the relationship of self-concept information to success in the first-year teaching. Scores such as those available from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, administered following employment, might be helpful to those responsible for placement and in-service education of novice, and perhaps more experienced teachers.[4]

Numerous researchers and psychologists have generally agreed that lower-class black students have lower self-concepts than do some white and middle-class black students--this, many believe, could ultimately affect their performance and academic grades.

When the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was administered to teacher trainees enrolled in a state university, a private teachers' college, a southern Negro university, and the University of Chicago, it was revealed that Negro teacher trainees enrolled in the southern Negro university showed a different pattern of needs than those trainees enrolled in the other three institutions. An

---

[4]Reba Garvey, "Self-Concept and Success in Student Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Fall, 1970): 360.

examination of the need structure revealed that the pattern was a cultural one for southern Negro students and not for teacher trainees in general.[5]

The instrument used to assess self-concept in this study was the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. This instrument purports to measure fifteen relatively independent normal personality variables based on a list proposed by H. A. Murry:

> 1. ach Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.
> 2. def Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and to do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.
> 3. ord Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.
> 4. exh Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

---

[5]Charters and Gage, Reading in the Social Psychology of Education, p. 275.

5. aut Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. aff Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. int Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. suc Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. dom Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. aba Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doings, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. nur Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with

others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. chg Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. end Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. het Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. agg Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.[6]

Correlation Coefficients

Table 4 reflects the correlation coefficients between internship teaching performance and the fifteen personality variables as revealed in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule for the Jefferson County Career Opportunities Program. The Achievement relationship was +.23. The Deference relationship was +.05. The Order

[6] A. L. Edwards, Personal Preference Schedule (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959).

relationship was -.08. The Exhibition relationship was +.14. The Autonomy relationship was +.06 and the Affiliation relationship was +.07. The Intraception relationship was +.27. The Succorance relationship was a +.07. The Dominance relationship indicated a +.09 and the Abasement relationship revealed a -.38. The Nurturance relationship showed a -.16. The Change relationship revealed a -.01. The Endurance relationship indicated a -.08; the Heterosexuality relationship, a +.06; and the Aggression relationship, a -.12.

TABLE 4

JEFFERSON COUNTY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	+.23
Def	+.05
Ord	-.08
Exh	+.14
Aut	+.06
Aff	+.07
Int	+.27
Suc	+.07
Dom	+.09
Aba	-.38
Nur	-.16
Chg	-.01
End	-.08
Het	+.06
Agg	-.12

Table 5 indicates the correlation coefficients between grade-point average and the fifteen personality variables in the Edwards Schedule for Jefferson County COP.

TABLE 5

JEFFERSON COUNTY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN GRADE-POINT AVERAGE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	-.11
Def	-.05
Ord	-.32
Exh	-.06
Aut	+.50
Aff	+.09
Int	-.02
Suc	-.03
Dom	+.02
Aba	-.11
Nur	-.07
Chg	+.03
End	-.31
Het	+.12
Agg	+.17

The Achievement relationship was-.11. The Deference relationship indicated a -.05 and the Order relationship revealed a -.32. The Exhibition relationship indicated a -.06. The Autonomy relationship revealed a +.50. The Affiliation relationship indicated +.09. The Intraception relationship was -.02. The Succorance relationship was a -.03 and the Dominance relationship was a +.02. The Abasement relationship indicated a -.11. The Nurturance relationship was -.07. The Change relationship was +.03

and the Endurance relationship was a -.31. The Heterosexuality relationship indicated a +.12.. The Aggression relationship was a +.17.

Table 6 reflects the correlation coefficients between internship teaching performance and the fifteen variables in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule for the Huntsville City Career Opportunities Program.

TABLE 6

HUNTSVILLE CITY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	-.22
Def	-.07
Ord	+.27
Exh	-.21
Aut	+.11
Aff	+.02
Int	-.09
Suc	+.04
Dom	-.06
Aba	+.09
Nur	+.06
Chg	-.02
End	-.02
Het	-.03
Agg	-.26

The Achievement relationship was -.22. The Deference relationship indicated a -.07 and the Order relationship indicated a +.27. The Exhibition relationship was a -.21. The Autonomy relationship revealed a +.11 and the Affiliation relationship showed a +.02. The Intraception

relationship indicated a -.09. The Succorance relationship was a +.04. The Dominance relationship indicated a -.06. The Abasement relationship was a +.09. The Nurturance relationship indicated a +.06. The Change relationship was a -.02. The Endurance relationship indicated a -.02. The Heterosexuality relationship was -.03 and the Aggression relationship was -.26.

Table 7 shows the correlation coefficients between grade-point average and Edwards' fifteen personality variables for the Huntsville City COP.

TABLE 7

HUNTSVILLE CITY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN GRADE-POINT AVERAGE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	+.14
Def	+.08
Ord	+.20
Exh	+.04
Aut	+.22
Aff	+.12
Int	+.21
Suc	-.07
Dom	+.08
Aba	-.19
Nur	-.04
Chg	+.11
End	-.16
Het	-.11
Agg	+.21

The Achievement relationship indicated a +.14. The Deference relationship was +.08. The Order relationship

revealed a +.20. The Exhibition relationship indicated a +.04. The Autonomy relationship was a +.22 and the Affiliation relationship was a +.12. The Intraception relationship revealed a +.21. The Succorance relationship was a -.07. The Dominance relationship revealed a +.08. The Abasement relationship was -.19. The Nurtuerance relationship indicated a -.04 and the Change relationship indicated a +.11. The Endurance relationship was a -.16. The Heterosexuality relationship indicated a -.11. The Aggression relationship was a +.21.

Table 8 indicates the correlation coefficients between internship teaching performance and the fifteen personality variables described in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule for the Wilcox County Career Opportunities Program. The Achievement relationship was -.01. The Deference relationship indicated a -.25. The Order relationship was a -.13. The Exhibition relation ship revealed a +.29. The Autonomy relationship was a +.32 and the Affiliation relationship was a +.35. The Intraception relationship indicated a -.49. The Succorance relationship was a +.29. The Dominance relationship revealed a -.14. The Abasement relationship was a -.02. The Nurturance relationship indicated a +.11. The Change relationship revealed a +.002. The Endurance relationship was a -.16. The Heterosexuality relationship indicated a -.54. The Aggression relationship yielded a +.16.

TABLE 8

WILCOX COUNTY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	-.01
Def	-.25
Ord	-.13
Exh	+.29
Aut	+.32
Aff	+.35
Int	-.49
Suc	+.29
Dom	-.14
Aba	-.02
Nur	+.11
Chg	+.002
End	-.16
Het	-.54
Agg	+.16

Table 9 reveals the correlation coefficients between grade-point average and the fifteen personality variables in the Edwards Schedule for the Wilcox County COP. The Achievement relationship yielded a +.54. The Deference relationship was a +.33. The Order relationship indicated a +.14. The Exhibition relationship was a -.23. The Autonomy relationship was a +.04. The Affiliation relationship was -.35. The Intraception relationship indicated a +.14. The Succorance relationship was a -.05. The Dominance relationship reflected a +.14. The Abasement relationship was a -.50. The Nurturance relationship indicated a +.18. The Change relationship revealed a +.38.

The Endurance relationship was a -.26. The Heterosexuality relationship indicated a +.15. The Aggression relationship was a +.06.

TABLE 9

WILCOX COUNTY CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN GRADE-POINT AVERAGE AND SELF-CONCEPT

Self-Concept Variables	r
Ach	+.54
Def	+.33
Ord	+.14
Exh	-.23
Aut	+.04
Aff	-.35
Int	+.14
Suc	-.05
Dom	+.14
Aba	-.50
Nur	+.18
Chg	+.38
End	-.26
Het	+.15
Agg	+.06

Summary

A number of researchers agree that many lower-class students tend to overcome the social class structure and move on and get a good education. A literature search indicated that little success has been achieved in relating personality and attitudinal factors to earned grades. However, the self-concept of ability has been the most powerful predictor of scholarship.

Studies indicate that the high ratings of student teachers confirm what teacher educators and supervisors have long suspected--that success in student teaching is affective but not necessarily determined by a positive view of one's self, lack of confusion in self-perception, and good judgment.

When the need structure was examined among teacher trainees enrolled in four colleges and universities, trainees enrolled at a southern Negro university showed a different pattern of needs than those enrolled in the other institutions.

CHAPTER V.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The major focus of this study was to determine if a functionable relationship existed between internship teaching performance and academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees who interned in three local education agency school systems and attended three cooperating institutions of higher education in Alabama. The minor focus of the study was to determine if there were functionable relationships among internship teaching performance and self-concept; academic grades and self-concept.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation, referred to earlier, was used to determine relationships. A table of coefficients of correlation, significant at the 1 per cent level and the 5 per cent level, with appropriate degrees of freedom was used to refute or affirm the null hypothesis.

A review of Table 10 indicates that the Jefferson County Career Opportunities Program trainees had the lowest mean internship teaching performance rating score of 112.9 with a standard deviation of 35.7. The mean grade-point average was 1.4 with a standard deviation of .34.

TABLE 10

VARIABLES, MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR JEFFERSON COUNTY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN BIRMINGHAM

Variables	Means	S.D.	Correlation Coefficients: ITP with GPA and Self-Concept	Correlation Coefficients: GPA with ITP and Self-Concept
GPA	1.4	.34	+ .14	+1.00
ITP	112.9	35.7	+1.00	+ .14
Ach	15.1	4.3	+ .23	- .11
Def	14.8	2.7	+ .05	- .05
Ord	14.0	4.0	- .08	- .32
Exh	12.4	3.9	+ .14	- .06
Aut	9.6	3.1	+ .06	+ .50
Aff	12.8	4.0	+ .07	+ .09
Int	18.0	3.9	+ .27	- .02
Suc	11.5	4.3	+ .07	- .03
Dom	12.8	4.3	+ .09	+ .02
Aba	15.5	4.7	- .38	- .11
Nur	15.4	3.7	- .16	- .07
Chg	16.4	4.9	- .01	+ .03
End	18.6	5.1	- .08	- .31
Het	11.3	6.5	+ .06	+ .12
Agg	11.9	3.6	- .12	+ .17

N = 25

The correlation coefficient between internship teaching performance and academic grades revealed a slight (+.14) relationship.

According to Table 10, the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept as perceived by fifteen variables on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule indicated an Achievement mean of 15.1 and a standard deviation of 4.3. The correlation coefficient (.23) indicated a low relationship. The Deference mean was 14.8 and a standard deviation of 2.7. The correlation coefficient (+.05) indicated a practically nil relationship. The Order mean was 14.0 with a standard deviation of 4.0. The correlation coefficient (-.08) showed a slight inverse relationship. The Exhibition mean was 12.4 and a standard deviation of 3.9. The correlation coefficient (+.14) indicated a slight relationship. The Autonomy mean was 9.6 and a standard deviation of 3.1. The correlation coefficient (+.06) indicated a slight relationship. The Affiliation mean was 12.8 with a standard deviation of 4.0. The correlation coefficient (+.07) showed a slight relationship. The Intraception mean was 18.0 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The correlation coefficient (+.27) indicated a low relationship. The Succorance mean was 11.5 with a standard deviation of 4.3. The correlation coefficient (+.07) indicated a slight relationship. The Dominance mean was 12.8 with a standard deviation of 4.3. The correlation coefficient

(+.09) indicated a slight relationship. The Abasement mean was 15.5 with a standard deviation of 4.7. The correlation coefficient (-.38) indicated a definite inverse relationship at the 5 per cent level. It is shown that Nurturance had a mean of 15.4 and a standard deviation of 3.7. A correlation coefficient (-.16) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The variable Change had a mean of 16.4 with a standard deviation of 4.9. A coefficient of correlation (-.01) revealed a practically nil relationship. The mean for Endurance was 18.6 with a standard deviation of 5.1. The correlation coefficient (-.08) revealed a slight inverse relationship. The Heterosexuality mean was 11.3 with a standard deviation of 6.5. A coefficient of correlation (+.06) revealed a slight relationship. The mean for Aggression was 11.9 with a standard deviation of 3.6. A correlation coefficient (-.12) indicated a slight inverse relationship.

Table 10 reveals the relationship between grade-point average and self-concept as indicated by fifteen variables. The correlation coefficient for Achievement (-.11) indicated a slight inverse relationship. A correlation coefficient for Deference (-.05) showed a slight inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Order (-.32) indicated a low inverse relationship. A correlation coefficient for Exhibition (-.06) revealed a slight inverse relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Autonomy (+.50) was definitely a significant

relationship at the 1 per cent level. A correlation coefficient for Affiliation (+.09) showed a slight relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Intraception (-.02) was practically nil inverse relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Succorance (-.03) showed an almost nil inverse relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Dominance (+.02) was an almost nil relationship. The correlation coefficient for Abasement (-.11) indicated a slight inverse relationship. A correlation coefficient for Nurturance (-.07) indicated a negligible inverse relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Change (+.03) indicated the existence of an almost nil relationship. The correlation coefficient for Endurance (-,31) showed a low inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Heterosexuality (+.12) indicated a slight relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Aggression (+.17) showed a slight relationship.

A review of Table 11 reveals the Huntsville City School System COP trainees had a mean internship teaching performance rating of 155.4 with a standard deviation of 15.3. The highest mean grade-point average was 2.8 with a standard deviation of .65. The coefficient of correlation between internship teaching performance and academic grades revealed a +.05 which was a slight relationship.

Table 11 for the Huntsville City School System COP indicates the relationship between internship teaching

TABLE 11

VARIABLES, MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR HUNTSVILLE CITY AND ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY

Variables	Means	S.D.	Correlation Coefficients	
			ITP with GPA and Self-Concept	GPA with ITP and Self-Concept
GPA	2.8	.65	+ .05	+1.00
ITP	155.4	15.3	+1.00	+ .05
Ach	15.0	4.0	- .22	+ .14
Def	14.45	3.9	- .07	+ .08
Ord	14.2	4.7	+ .27	+ .20
Exh	11.7	4.1	- .21	+ .04
Aut	11.5	3.7	+ .11	+ .22
Aff	15.3	3.7	+ .02	+ .12
Int	17.0	3.8	- .09	+ .21
Suc	12.0	3.9	+ .04	- .07
Dom	11.9	4.2	- .06	+ .08
Aba	15.0	4.5	+ .09	- .19
Nur	16.0	4.7	+ .06	- .04
Chg	17.2	4.5	- .02	+ .11
End	15.03	4.4	- .02	- .16
Het	13.5	6.2	- .03	- .11
Agg	10.7	3.9	- .26	+ .21

N = 33

performance and self-concept, as reflected by fifteen variables. It reveals an Achievement mean of 15.0 with a standard deviation of 4.0. The correlation coefficient (-.22) was a low inverse relationship.. The Deference mean was 14.45 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The correlation coefficient (-.07) was a slight inverse relationship. The Order mean was 14.2 with a standard deviation of 4.7. The coefficient of correlation (+.27) was a low relationship. The Exhibition mean was a 11.7 with a standard deviation of 4.1. The coefficient of correlation (-.21) indicated a low inverse relationship. The Autonomy mean was a 11.5 with a standard deviation of 3.7. A coefficient of correlation (+.11) revealed a slight relationship. The Affiliation mean was 15.3 with a standard deviation of 3.7. The correlation coefficient (+.02) indicated an almost nil relationship. The Intraception mean was 17.0 with a standard deviation of 3.8. A correlation coefficient (-.09)indicated a slight inverse relationship. The Succorance mean was 12.0 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The correlation (+.04) revealed a slight nil relationship. The Dominance mean was 11.9 with a standard deviation of 4.2. A correlation coefficient (-.06) revealed a slight inverse relationship. The Abasement mean was 15.0 with a standard deviation of 4.5. The coefficient of correlation (+.09) indicated a slight relationship. The Nurturance mean was 16.0 with a standard

deviation of 4.7. The coefficient of correlation (+.06) showed the relationship to be slight. The Change mean was 17.2 with a standard deviation of 4.5. The correlation coefficient (-.02) indicated a practically nil inverse relationship. The Endurance mean was 15.03 with a standard deviation of 4.4. The correlation coefficient (-.02) was a practically nil inverse relationship. Heterosexuality mean was 13.5 with a standard deviation of 6.2. The coefficient of correlation (-.03) indicated an almost nil inverse relationship. The aggression mean was 10.7 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The coefficient correlation (-.26) revealed a low inverse relationship.

Table 11 further reveals that grade-point average was correlated with the fifteen personality variables on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The coefficient of correlation for Achievement (+.14) indicated a slight relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Deference (+.08) indicated a slight relationship. A correlation coefficient for Order (+.20) revealed a low relationship. The correlation coefficient for Exhibition (+.04) indicated an almost nil relationship. The correlation of coefficient for Autonomy (+.22) showed a low relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Affiliation (+.12) indicated a slight relationship. The coefficient correlation for Intraception (+.21) indicated a low relationship. The coefficient correlation for Succorance (-.07) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The coefficient of

correlation for Dominance (+.08) showed a slight relationship. The correlation coefficient for Abasement (-.19) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Nurturance (-.04) revealed an almost nil relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Change (+.11) showed a slight relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Endurance (-.16) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Heterosexuality (-.11) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The correlation of coefficient for Aggression (+.21) indicated a low relationship.

Table 12 indicates the Wilcox County Career Opportunities Program trainees had the highest mean internship teaching performance rating of 156.5 and a standard deviation of 12.6. The lowest mean grade-point average was 1.6 with a standard deviation of .12. The correlation coefficient between internship teaching performance and grade-point average was -.22 which was a low inverse relationship.

Table 12 reveals that the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept as outlined in Edwards' fifteen personality variables indicated an Achievement mean of 15.0 with a standard deviation of 3.1. The coefficient of correlation (-.01) revealed a practically nil inverse relationship. The Deference mean was 15.3 with a standard deviation of 3.1. The coefficient of correlation (-.25) showed a low inverse

TABLE 12

VARIABLES, MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR WILCOX COUNTY AND SPRING HILL COLLEGE

Variables	Means	S.D.	Correlation Coefficients: ITP with GPA and Self-Concept	Correlation Coefficients: GPA with ITP and Self-Concept
GPA	1.0	.12	- .22	+1.00
ITP	156.5	12.6	+1.00	- .22
Ach	15.0	3.1	- .01	+ .54
Def	15.3	3.1	- .25	+ .33
Ord	16.0	4.6	- .13	+ .14
Exh	9.8	3.1	+ .29	- .23
Aut	11.0	5.1	+ .32	+ .04
Aff	13.5	3.3	+ .35	- .35
Int	14.9	3.9	- .49	+ .14
Suc	13.3	4.9	+ .29	- .05
Dom	11.1	4.8	- .14	+ .14
Aba	18.2	3.6	- .02	- .50
Nur	16.9	3.4	+ .11	+ .18
Chg	14.8	3.3	+ .002	+ .38
End	17.9	2.9	- .16	- .26
Het	11.9	7.2	- .54	+ .15
Agg	11.9	3.4	+ .16	+ .06

N = 15

relationship. The Order mean was 16.0 with a standard deviation of 4.6. The coefficient of correlation (-.13) indicated a slight inverse relationship. The Exhibition mean was 9.8 and showed a standard deviation of 3.1. The correlation coefficient (+.29) showed a low inverse relationship. The Autonomy mean was 11.0 with a standard deviation of 5.1. The correlation coefficient (+.32) indicated a low relationship. The Affiliation mean was 13.5 with a standard deviation of 3.3. The coefficient of correlation (+.35) indicated a low relationship. The mean for Intraception was 14.9 with a standard deviation of 3.9. A correlation coefficient (-.49) revealed an inverse moderate relationship. The Succorance mean was 13.3 and had a standard deviation of 4.9. The coefficient of correlation (+.29) showed a low relationship. The Dominance mean of 11.1 and a standard deviation of 4.8 revealed a correlation (-.14) which showed a slight inverse relationship. The Abasement mean was 18.2 with a standard deviation of 3.6, revealing a coefficient of correlation (-.02) which represented an almost nil inverse relationship. The Nurturance mean was 16.9 with a standard deviation of 3.4. This revealed a coefficient of correlation (+.11) which indicated a slight relationship. The Change mean of 14.8 with a standard deviation of 3.3 revealed a correlation coefficient (+.002) of practically no relationship. An Endurance mean of 17.9 with a standard deviation of 2.9 indicated a correlation

coefficient of -.16 which showed a slight inverse relationship. A Heterosexuality mean was 11.9 with a standard deviation of 7.2, indicating a correlation of -.54 which was inverse and significant at the 5 per cent level. The Aggression mean was 11.9 with a standard deviation of 3.4. The coefficient of correlation (+.16) indicated a slight relationship.

Table 12 further reveals that grade-point average, when correlated with the fifteen personality variables used for self-concept, showed a correlation coefficient for Achievement (+.54) which was significant at the .5 per cent level. The coefficient of correlation for Deference (+.33) indicated a low relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Order (+.14) revealed a slight relationship. A correlation coefficient for Exhibition (-.23) showed a low inverse relationship, A correlation coefficient of correlation coefficient for Affiliation (-.35) indicated a low inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Intraception (+.14) indicated a slight relationship. The coefficient of correlation for Succorance (-.05) showed a slight inverse relationship. The correlation for Dominance (+.14) revealed a low inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Abasement (-.50) indicated a definite inverse relationship at the 5 per cent level. The coefficient of correlation for Nurturance (+.18) revealed a slight relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Change (+.38) showed a low

relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Endurance (-.26) revealed a low inverse relationship. The correlation coefficient for Heterosexuality (+.15) indicated a slight relationship. A coefficient of correlation for Aggression (+.06) revealed a slight relationship.

For analyses of correlation coefficients, see Tables 13 and 14. Also see Compilation Tables 15, 16, and 17 in Appendix D.

TABLE 13

AN ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS ITP WITH GPA AND SELF-CONCEPT AMONG THREE SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND THREE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

Variables	Wilcox-Spring Hill	Huntsville-A&M	Jefferson-UAB
GPA	0	0	0
ITP			
Ach	0	0	0
Def	0	0	0
Ord	0	0	0
Exh	0	0	0
Aut	0	0	0
Aff	0	0	0
Int	0	0	0
Suc	0	0	0
Dom	0	0	0
Aba	0	0	-*
Nur	0	0	0
Chg	0	0	0
End	0	0	0
Het	-*	0	0
Agg	0	0	0
	N = 15	N = 33	N = 25

0--Not Significant
*--Significant at 5 per cent level

TABLE 14

AN ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS GPA WITH ITP AND SELF-CONCEPT AMONG THREE SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND THREE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

Variables	Wilcox-Spring Hill	Huntsville-A&M	Jefferson-UAB
GPA			
ITP	0	0	0
Ach	*	0	0
Def	0	0	0
Ord	0	0	0
Exh	0	0	0
Aut	0	0	**
Aff	0	0	0
Int	0	0	0
Suc	0	0	0
Dom	0	0	0
Aba	-*	0	0
Nur	0	0	0
Chg	0	0	0
End	0	0	0
Het	0	0	0
Agg	0	0	0
	N = 15	N = 33	N = 25

0--Not Significant
*--Significant at 5 per cent level
**--Significant at 1 per cent level

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Many researchers and educationists are aware of the many variables involved in teaching performance besides grades earned at teacher training institutions. There are proponents of the internship-teaching-performance-process who believe that knowing, alone, is not a valid criterion for becoming a teacher. A teacher, many believe, must be able to perform, as well as earn satisfactory grades, at the institution of high education. The question may be raised as to who shall become a teacher. Shall middle-class individuals who have not been introduced to life "across the tracks" become vicariously only teachers?

Summary

With the above notions in mind, the present study attempted to determine the relationship between internship teaching performance and academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees. The relationship among internship teaching performance, academic grades, and self-concept for Career Opportunities Program trainees were also ascertained.

Conclusions

The data collected in this investigation resulted in the first hypothesis being sustained and five variables in the second being rejected. These hypotheses are respectively:

There is no relationship between internship teach- performance and academic grades, and

There is no relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept; there is no relationship between academic grades and self-concept.

The correlation coefficient between internship teaching performance and academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees in the Jefferson County School System was not significant. The coefficient of correlation between internship teaching performance and academic grades for Career Opportunities Program trainees in the Wilcox County School System was an inverse relationship which was not significant.

The data for COP trainees in the Jefferson County School System indicated the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept as revealed by Edwards' fifteen personality variables showed Abasement to be significant. The data for the Jefferson County School System disclosed the relationship between academic grades and self-concept to be not significant save Autonomy.

The data for COP trainees in the Huntsville City School System indicated the relationship between internship

teaching performance and self-concept to be not significant. The data further indicated the relationship between academic grades and self-concept to be not significant.

The data for COP trainees in the Wilcox County School System showed the relationship between internship teaching performance and self-concept to be not significant save Heterosexuality. This variable indicated an inverse relationship which was significant. The data further revealed the relationship between grade-point average and self-concept to be not significant save Achievement and Abasement.

Recommendations

The following recommendations have stemmed from the results of the present investigation:

1. The study was concerned with seventy-three COP trainees--sixty-six female and seven males--who interned at three different school systems and attended three cooperating institutions of higher education. A similar study should include more trainees, especially males. A number of different kinds of institutions for the training of teachers should be included. Other ethnic groups should be involved.

2. While this research effort involved COP trainees in various stages of academic preparation and internship teaching, other studies should give consideration to equal amounts of academic training and internship

teaching experiences.

3. Most studies involving teacher evaluation are concerned with the evaluation by principals, supervisor, and the like. Other studies should include the perceptions and behavior of the child--product evaluation.

4. Few studies include measures of self-concept of teachers or teacher trainees. Other studies should involve many kinds of attitudinal and personality instruments.

5. The present study was concerned with only elementary COP trainees. Future studies should involve secondary trainees.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS REQUESTING PERMISSION TO COLLECT DATA

JEFFCO

Jefferson County Board Of Education
A-400 Courthouse Building
Birmingham Alabama 35203
Telephone 205/325-5222

November __, 1973

Dear Sirs:

Sometime ago, the Director of the Alabama COP Consortium granted me permission to collect data from certain consortium members for a proposed study entitled "A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC GRADES AND INTERNSHIP TEACHING PERFORMANCE FOR COP STUDENTS."

The data collecting devices will be a short rating scale to be filled out by supervising teachers and the coordinators, a personal preference inventory to be administered to trainees, and college grade-point averages secured.

I would immensely appreciate your giving me permission to use your COP in my study. The results of the study will be made available to all participants.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO NON-RESPONDENTS

JEFFCO ED

Jefferson County Board Of Education
A-400 Courthouse Building
Birmingham Alabama 35203
Telephone 205/325-5222

January 1, 1974

Dear Sirs:

In November, 1973, a letter was written to you regarding a proposed study entitle "A Study of the Relationship Between Academic Grades and Internship Teaching Performance for COP Students."

It was indicated in the letter that a short rating scale was to be filled out jointly by supervising teachers and IHE coordinators, a personal preference inventory to be administered to trainees, and college grade-point averages secured. The names of the trainees should be coded.

The research on the subject thus far seems interesting. I, therefore, am desirous of including your COP in the investigation.

Thank you for any consideration given me.

Respectfully yours,

APPENDIX C

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING SCALE

JEFFERSON COUNTY SCHOOLS
CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
EVALUATION FORM

DATE_____ TRAINEE_____

SUPERVISING TEACHER_____ SCHOOL_____

Directions: Opposite each sub-sub-topic (1, 2, 3, etc.) place X under the number which best describes the trait.
1--unsatisfactory, 2--poor, 3--fair, 4--good, 5--excellent

I. Personal Qualities

A. Appearance

1. Is well groomed (appropriate dress, cleanliness, etc.)

2. Demonstrates correct posture (standing, walking, and sitting at desk)

3. Is healthy (physically able to perform duties without too many breaks, absences, or illnesses)

B. Manner

1. Has pleasing voice quality and tone

2. Uses correct English.

3. Accepts criticisms willingly

4. Maintains self-control

5. Adjusts easily to change in procedures.

II. Performance

A. Classroom Environment

1. Helps to maintain an attractive, meaningful conducive to learning atmosphere

3. Shows initiative

3. Is creative, imaginative, and productive

4. Can maintain class control

B. Pupil Growth

1. Helps pupils develop good study and work habits

2. Has concern for and acceptance of all pupils

3. Leads pupils into democratic participation and sharing of responsibilities

4. Encourages pupils to make decisions

C. Teaching Techniques

1. Plans and organizes work efficiently

2. Conducts group discussions effectively

3. Possesses adequate subject matter background

4. Makes and uses a variety of teaching aides including the operation of audio-visual equipment

5. Tutors pupils in subject areas in which they are weak

6. Is able to plan and teach a lesson

7. Assists teacher in developing a resource unit

8. Effectively assists teacher in maintaining register, report cards, and other school reports

III. Dependability

A. Promptness

1. Arrives on time and goes directly to classroom

2. Strictly adheres to the schedule set by the teacher or principal

B. Reliance

1. Completes assignment tasks within a reasonable time limit

2. Provides adequate supervision in hall and lunchroom

3. Puts materials in proper place after using them

4. Capable of independent self-direction and of making necessary decisions regarding work

IV. Professional Attitude

A. On the Job

1. Has pleasant, cooperative attitude toward supervising teacher

2. Shows respect to faculty and personnel

B. General

1. Is proud of the profession and attempts to promote respect for it.

2. Seeks to improve self by studying, observing, experimenting, and participating

3. Adheres to any reasonable pattern of behavior accepted by the community for professional people

If there is any characteristic not listed that you feel should be included, please write it below..

APPENDIX D

COMPILATION TABLES

TABLE 15

COMPILATION TABLE FOR JEFFERSON COUNTY AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN BIRMINGHAM

Name Code	GPA	ITP	Self-Concept														
			ach	def	ord	exh	aut	aff	int	suc	dom	aba	nur	chg	end	het	agg
01	1.09	136	23	18	19	14	6	10	22	6	16	12	9	16	19	7	13
02	1.53	138	9	19	13	9	9	18	15	11	9	20	18	24	16	10	10
03	1.21	140	10	13	10	8	11	9	20	15	19	16	12	22	20	17	18
04	.50	107	17	14	18	11	7	12	12	13	8	15	22	22	23	4	12
05	1.35	163	16	16	22	17	10	19	22	17	13	12	16	7	12	0	11
06	1.84	97	18	16	13	11	15	13	19	7	16	18	16	14	16	3	15
07	1.24	151	22	13	24	11	10	15	12	10	3	21	11	16	25	7	10
08	1.68	164	7	12	14	8	11	19	17	11	12	11	16	20	14	20	13
09	1.12	144	14	18	16	14	13	12	22	8	15	12	11	15	26	7	7
010	1.60	156	11	14	13	12	7	17	13	16	15	15	12	23	18	14	10
011	1.32	114	9	15	13	16	6	10	12	15	11	12	20	8	24	26	13
012	1.16	171	23	20	11	16	8	7	23	7	14	10	13	15	19	16	8
013	1.30	158	10	16	8	9	4	14	21	7	14	26	21	10	22	12	16
014	1.29	156	21	14	12	21	10	7	16	13	12	11	14	10	17	17	14
015	1.57	146	14	16	13	12	13	16	19	7	8	18	21	21	21	5	6
016	1.80	148	17	16	21	11	5	15	16	9	17	21	13	12	24	4	9
017	.50	90	14	11	14	9	8	14	21	12	13	19	18	17	15	9	16
018	1.60	140	11	9	3	19	15	10	16	10	18	13	17	23	5	16	15
019	1.16	164	17	13	10	13	10	23	17	16	13	14	17	20	18	2	7
020	1.37	166	16	11	16	9	11	9	18	12	11	20	13	15	15	18	16
021	1.41	175	13	14	8	11	7	14	27	19	18	5	20	21	12	13	8
022																	
023																	
024	1.59	144	15	10	11	8	13	10	21	14	12	12	14	17	20	18	16
025	1.68	157	19	17	13	15	12	7	13	7	20	19	12	11	25	9	11
026	1.11	134	18	17	19	7	7	12	16	12	7	22	18	15	21	12	7
027	1.78	150	13	18	16	20	13	9	21	4	6	13	10	16	17	17	17

TABLE 16

COMPILATION TABLE FOR HUNTSVILLE CITY
AND ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY

Name Code	GPA	ITF	Self-Concept														
			ach	def	ord	exh	aut	aff	int	suc	dom	aba	nur	chg	end	het	agg
01	1.81	171	17	14	21	15	17	12	15	17	8	21	15	11	15	4	8
02	2.04	143	12	14	4	14	15	16	22	12	13	8	19	20	16	19	6
03																	
04	3.33	168	27	21	15	15	16	6	14	1	16	9	5	20	20	8	17
05	3.30	123	12	6	10	17	15	12	23	14	9	11	19	19	20	12	11
06	3.10	140	18	17	14	11	5	21	16	14	15	20	12	10	15	6	16
07	3.95	162	15	20	18	8	12	14	17	12	10	15	6	21	8	10	24
08	2.00	175	14	11	14	12	14	11	13	16	15	16	16	18	14	15	11
09	3.00	172	14	20	20	8	15	15	20	12	5	15	10	17	12	18	9
010	1.90	136	18	17	18	10	12	22	5	16	10	16	12	14	10	15	15
011	2.10	133	21	16	14	6	9	16	11	13	8	20	14	18	18	15	11
012	2.64	163	17	17	14	5	8	15	17	14	4	19	25	18	19	10	9
013	2.30	149	14	13	16	6	9	12	22	5	7	22	15	23	16	18	12
014	2.16	153	14	19	25	11	7	15	21	11	9	11	12	21	16	8	10
015																	
016	3.19	161	15	17	20	9	13	20	21	10	9	8	14	23	15	8	8
017	2.53	172	13	17	18	10	9	13	18	13	15	11	10	11	24	16	12
018																	
019	3.76	135	17	18	10	20	13	14	15	13	13	5	15	16	10	19	12
020	3.15	133	17	2	7	22	12	14	17	10	17	11	14	14	15	28	10
021	2.52	159	10	15	12	8	12	9	18	10	16	15	13	18	14	23	17
022																	
023	2.03	151	11	12	12	11	14	13	22	10	7	16	14	15	16	19	18

TABLE 16--Continued

Name Code	GPA	ITP	Self-Concept														
			ach	def	ord	exh	aut	aff	int	suc	dom	aba	nur	chg	end	het	agg
024	1.86	156	14	10	17	8	5	16	17	12	14	15	13	25	19	17	8
025																	
026	3.71	175	15	12	16	14	17	14	15	9	22	11	13	15	11	14	12
027	3.02	174	16	19	20	10	9	17	13	11	9	23	22	3	23	8	7
028	3.79	140	21	17	10	12	10	16	22	19	9	9	16	17	16	10	6
029	3.57	164	18	11	12	9	14	17	15	9	16	20	22	22	5	18	2
030																	
031	2.71	172	16	10	10	13	7	16	12	9	10	18	18	22	19	20	10
032	2.59	159	13	15	20	10	7	15	17	11	14	16	21	15	20	4	12
033	2.11	156	18	19	16	13	9	19	14	9	19	15	20	16	16	4	3
034	2.45	159	8	20	11	11	8	17	22	12	10	18	22	21	17	5	8
035	2.80	140	13	14	16	8	14	12	24	15	14	13	20	13	18	5	11
036	3.90	174	9	10	8	19	16	22	21	14	8	13	19	20	9	18	4
037	3.09	170	10	9	9	8	9	22	16	13	8	21	22	20	9	20	13
038	2.18	165	8	14	8	17	16	19	9	18	7	18	18	17	11	18	12
039	3.10	126	19	11	14	16	13	14	15	2	16	21	23	14	10	12	10

TABLE 17

COMPILATION TABLE FOR WILCOX COUNTY AND SPRING HILL COLLEGE

Name Code	GPA	ITP	Self-Concent														
			ach	def	ord	exh	aut	aff	int	suc	dom	aba	nur	chg	end	het	agg
01	1.3	175	18	12	12	14	17	15	13	15	11	20	11	14	20	8	10
02																	
03																	
04																	
05	1.6	144	13	15	14	12	7	13	15	15	3	19	15	14	17	24	14
06																	
07																	
08	1.4	164	13	9	17	10	19	13	17	16	14	13	15	5	16	25	28
09	1.3	165	16	13	7	11	5	18	13	22	7	17	17	20	16	17	13
010																	
011	1.5	153	16	16	17	9	13	13	14	19	11	20	20	12	18	7	5
012	1.5	175	13	18	23	11	8	17	12	10	9	17	20	13	20	8	11
013																	
014	1.8	146	8	15	17	10	8	13	17	9	7	23	20	15	16	24	8
015	0.4	157	12	11	14	8	11	16	16	12	12	22	17	14	19	10	16
016																	
017																	
018	1.7	157	14	19	22	6	2	9	23	15	7	21	15	15	23	9	10
019	2.0	138	18	13	25	3	4	17	19	14	10	13	17	19	18	11	9
020	2.0	168	21	16	14	5	18	14	11	16	13	14	21	26	11	9	15
021	2.2	142	19	17	11	10	14	6	20	6	20	17	16	12	19	13	10
022	1.7	171	12	16	17	11	13	17	15	13	8	21	22	13	15	5	12
023	1.9	151	16	20	16	13	13	11	16	5	21	16	10	15	22	4	12
024																	
025	1.8	142	16	18	16	6	13	11	12	13	13	20	18	15	18	5	16

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bolton, Dale L. Selection and Evaluation of Teachers. Berkeley: McCritchen, 1973.

Charters, W. W., and Gage, N. L. Reading in the Social Psychology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1970.

Kalish, Richard A. The Psychology of Human Behavior. Belmont: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1970.

Richmond, Samuel B. Statistical Analysis. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1905.

Runyon, Richard P., and Haber, Audrey. Fundamental Behavioral Statistics. Reading: Wesley Publishing Company, 1971.

Walker, Helen M., and Lev, Joseph. Elementary Statistical Methods. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

Periodicals

Calisch, Richard W. "So You Want to Be a Real Teacher." Today's Education 63 (November 1969): 49-51.

Davies, Don. "Come Out From Under the Ivy." American Education 6 (March 1970): 28-30.

_____. "EPDA: An Inside Perspective." COP Bulletin 5 2 (1974-75): 11.

Dickson, George. "BTA: Its Origins and Its State." COP Bulletin 3 2 (1974-75): 3.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The Reform of Teacher Education." Today's Education 63 (April 1973): 20.

Gartner, Alan, and Riessman, Frank. "Children: Workers in Their Own Learning--A New Basis for the Organizing of Schools." COP Bulletin 3 2 (1974-75): 1-15.

Garvey, Reba. "Self-Concept and Success in Student Teaching." The Journal of Teacher Education 21 (Fall 1970): 360.

Hilgard, Ernest. "The Human Dimension in College Teaching." NEA Journal 50 (September 1965): 43-45.

Holt, John. "I Oppose Testing, Marking, and Grading." Today's Education 60 (March 1971): 29.

Horn, Gunnar. "Some Thoughts about Teaching and Teachers." Today's Education 55 (September 1955): 13-45.

Ladas, Harold. "Grades: Standardizing the Unstandardized Standard." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (November 1974): 187.

McKenna, Bernard H. "Teacher Evaluation--Some Implications." Today's Education 62 (February 1973): 56.

Merrow, John. "Rutgers Graduate COP Program." COP Bulletin 4 2 (1974-75): 2

Mitzel, Harold E. "Can We Measure Teaching Objectives?" NEA Journal 53 (January 1964) 35.

Pigge, Fred L. "Teaching Effectiveness of 'A' and 'C' Elementary Teachers." Journal of Educational Research 62 (November 1968): 99-102.

Pishel, Robert C., Jr. "Achieved Grades as a Function of Self-Perceived Adaptability." Journal of Educational Research 67 (December 1973): 166.

Postman, Neil. "A D+ for Mr. Ladas." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (November 1974): 187.

Sweet, Alan. "A Decade of Paraprofessional Programs in Minneapolis Public Schools." COP Bulletin 6 2 (1974-75): 11-12.

Dissertations

Brewer, Wilbur A. "A Study of the Relationship Between Principal Rated Beginning Teacher Success and Certain Selected Aspects of Academic Achievement." Ed.D. dissertation. Washington State University, 1966.

Curry, George Wendell. "An Analysis of the Relationship of Academic Success to Teacher Placement and Success in Teaching of One Hundred Forty-one Student Teachers at Ball State University, 1961-62." Ed. D. dissertation. Ball State University, 1967.

Gerfen, Richard Lewis. "Analysis of Selected Variables in the Preparation and Performance of Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation. University of Southern California, 1970.

Greaves, Frank William. "Criteria for Teacher Selection Based upon a Comparison of Pregraduation Performance and Teaching Success." Ed.D. dissertation. Arizona State University, 1972.

Leavitt, William Carr. "The Relationship Among Performance in Student Teaching Scores on the National Teacher Examinations and Grade-Point Averages in Professional Courses and the First Teaching Field." Ed.D. dissertation. North Texas State University, 1969.

Mercer, Phyllis Beth. "A Study of the Relationship Between Scores on the National Teacher Examinations, Teaching Performance, and Other Variables in Selected Groups of Secondary Student Teachers." Ed.D. didsertation. East Texas State University, 1972.

Thacker, James Allen. "A Study of the Relationship Between Principals' Estimates of Teaching Efficiency and Scores on National Teacher Examinations, Academic Averages, and Supervision Estimates of Potential for Selected Teachers in North Carolina." Ph.D. dissertation. University of North Carolina, 1964.

Other Sources

Edwards, A. L. Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Poppendieck, Robert. "The Outlook for Performance Impact on Teacher Certification Paper Prepared for BEPO." Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education (n.d.), pp. 6-7.